Minutes
E-Government Infrastructure Work Group
Wednesday September 20, 2000, 10 a.m. to Noon
Executive Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room
521 South 14th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska

A. Participants

Rod Armstrong, NOL (471-7815, rod@nol.org)
Dave Berkland, DAS IMServices (471-0688; dberklan@notes.state.ne.us)
Tom Conroy, NIS Project (471-2123; tconroy@notes.state.ne.us)
Dale Fangmeier, IMServices (471-8655; dfangmei@notes.state.ne.us)
Steve Henderson, DAS IMServices (471-4861; Shenders@notes.state.ne.us)
Steve Schafer, CIO (471-4385; slschafe@notes.state.ne.us)
Sam Walls, Legislature Technical Center (471-2373; swalls@unicam.state.ne.us)
Art Zygielbaum, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (472-3611; aiz@unl.edu)

B. Review minutes from prior meetings

No changes or corrections.

C. Review Outcomes (pursuant to work group charter)

1. Prepare a checklist of key foundational prerequisites for implementing e-government;
2. Inventory capabilities of the state's foundation for e-government;
3. Assess capabilities of the state's foundation for e-government
   - identify types of applications that are possible, with examples
   - identify limitations with the current and proposed foundation, with examples
   - determine scalability in economic and technical terms
4. Review and revise "best practices" for the electronic government architecture

Recommend "policies, standards and guidelines" for the electronic government architecture

D. Discuss issues, typologies, and different approaches

There was a discussion of some of the topics mentioned by PK Agarwal and Gartner. Both talked about a service architecture that would represent a middle tier of enterprise services. PK emphasized the concept of brand development. This includes developing an image associated with the brand. PK's three-tier model received general endorsement:

- Presentation tier (portal)
- Enterprise services
- Individual systems of agencies (includes legacy systems)

Discussion turned to the two extremes for implementing e-government. One is to strive for complete, physical integration of information and services. The other is to endorse "stovepipe" systems with rules to facilitate integration. This might include separate portals and separate enterprise systems. A middle ground would look to maximize the advantages on a case-by-case basis or enterprise service by enterprise service. Criteria for deciding which model to follow might include:

1. Compatibility / Interoperability
2. Customer demands
3. Economics
4. Enterprise benefits
5. Infrastructure impact
6. Life-cycle cost impact
7. Maintainability
8. Organizational or statutory requirements
9. Performance
10. Privacy
11. Renewable
12. Security

Eventually, the architecture will consist of a matrix:

	Layer		
	Presentation	Enterprise Services	Data and Information
Purpose			
Owner			
Standards			
Clients			
Technology			

Participants identified the following list of functions that might be part of the middle tier of enterprise services:

1. Authentication
2. Digital archive
3. Encryption
4. Help desk
5. Integration services (data stores, message brokers, clearinghouse for data exchanges)
6. Payments
7. Privacy
8. Search engine
9. Secure signatures
10. Security
11. Shopping carts
12. Virtual private networks

Dave Berkland proposed that cost and timeliness are key factors in making architectural decisions. A computing environment may include data on multiple platforms, networks with several protocols, different processing requirements, servers and workstations. The challenge is in supporting several technologies in each category. Additional technologies, such as another network protocol, may represent exponential increases in support requirements.

E. Prepare Work Plan -- Next Steps

1. Document current architecture, using the matrix, above.

F. Set date for next meeting: The next meeting is Friday, October 6, 10 a.m. to noon at the Executive Building, 2nd floor conference room.